

COMPARATIVE EDUCATION REVIEW

The official organ of the Comparative Education Society

Editor: George Z. F. Bereday
Editorial Office: Teachers College
Columbia University, New York 27, N. Y.

Business Editor: Gerald Read
Business Office: Kent State University,
Kent, Ohio.

Vol. 1, No. 2.

October 1957

Words of encouragement have greeted the appearance of the first number of the *Comparative Education Review* from centers in this country and from universities in Britain, Canada, Germany and Italy. As the increased number of pages in this, the second number, indicates, the *Review* will now be launched on a program of cautious expansion.

An editorial report on current events and selected recent writings will henceforth be an additional feature of the *Review*. The Ford Foundation has just granted \$350,000 to the University of Chicago to create a Comparative Education Center. Dr. R. J. Havighurst, who has travelled this year in Latin America and Europe, is chairman of the committee that is to establish it. The South American Field Study, which was organized by Comparative Education Society under the leadership of Dr. Gerald Read and Dr. W. W. Brickman, visited 5 countries between August 17 and September 15. Next year the Society plans tentatively to organize a tour to the Soviet Union. It hopes to move in the direction of tours which would embrace one country at a time and would provide for one month's stay with more extensive visits to schools.

A new text is to be published by Macmillan (USA) in November. It is *An Introduction to the Study of Comparative Education* by Vernon Mallinson, Lecturer in

Comparative Education, University of Reading, just published in Britain by Heinemann. This book presents area studies in Western Europe, the USA, and the Soviet Union, together with historical materials on educational reformers from Froebel to Dewey. The book will be reviewed in our next issue. Rinehart will publish in the 1958-59 season another text by an English scholar. He is Dr. Edmund King, Lecturer in Comparative Education at King's College, University of London, whose book bears the tentative title of *Other People's Children*. It presents well written area studies of Denmark, England, France United States, Soviet Union and India.

IN THIS ISSUE

The challenge of Definitions in Comparative Education	p. 3
Problems of Educational Policy in Communist China	p. 4
Comparative Study in Religion and Education	p. 7
Recent Developments in the Soviet Schools: II	p. 10
The Significance of American Schools in Latin America	p. 19
Yearbook Publications in Comparative Education	p. 22

The appearance of the *Yearbook of Education* 1957, the *International Yearbook of Education* 1956, and the new *Yearbook of Education Around the World* 1957, is described elsewhere in this number of the Review. New bibliographies include *Studies in Comparative Education: Bibliography: 1956 Publications* issued by the United States Office of Education; and the *Annual Educational Bibliography 1955, Publication No. 178* published by the International Bureau of Education in Geneva and available in parts also in the Bureau's Monthly Bulletins.

As to other writings, from Germany comes a volume of essays by German, British and American scholars on the theoretical aspects of comparative education. Its title is *Vergleichende Erziehungswissenschaft* (Orbis, Berlin, 1956) edited by Hans Espe, the University Professor in Berlin. To the same source we owe a German translation of the 1817 classic by Marc-Antoine Jullien de Paris, *Skizzen und Verarbeiten zu einem Werk über die Vergleichende Erziehung*. This, the earliest pamphlet in Comparative Education, is not as yet available in English. To Japan, we owe a new periodical in Comparative Education. *The Bulletin of the Research Institute of Comparative Education and Culture* (English Edition, No. 1, March 1957) is published under the directorship of M. Hiratsuka, Professor of Education at Kiushu University. It contains articles by Japanese, British and American scholars.

New American references include *Confluence*, published by the Harvard University Summer School. The 1957 Spring and Summer numbers treat with "Education Today" and contain significant contributions on ten countries from Belgium and France to Ceylon and Indonesia. Among the articles in other journals, one might mention: C. Arnold Anderson, "The Social Status of University Students in Relation to Type of Economy: An International Comparison," *Transactions of the Third World Congress of Sociology*, vol. V; R. Freeman Butts, "The Liberal Arts and Professional Education in the Preparation of Teachers: An International Perspective," *The Educational Record*, July 1957; George Z. F. Bereday, "A Colombian Lesson in Comparative Method," *Teachers College Record*, April 1957; and D. Daiches, "Education in Democratic Society: U.S. and Britain Compared," *Commentary*, April, 1957.

As regards topics the present issue continues the pattern of its predecessor. Dr. Ulich's article deals with theory. Dr. Lauwerys' article and also the second part of the article on the Soviet Union, are area studies of communist education. Dr. Phenix's article presents a related comparative discipline. Dr. Fitzgerald's article introduces a new scholar in the field. Finally, the article on Yearbooks continues the reports on resources for research and teaching purposes.

G.Z.F.B.

COMPARATIVE EDUCATION REVIEW Vol. 1, No. 2, Oct. 1957

COMPARATIVE EDUCATION REVIEW is issued three times a year in June, October, and February. The subscription price is \$1.00 per year; foreign postage, 30 cents. Single issues are sold at 40 cents each. Publication offices, 525 West 120th Street, New York 27, New York; and 1227 Fairview Drive, Kent, Ohio. Editorial office at Teachers College, Columbia University, N.Y.C. 27. Business office at Kent State University, Kent Ohio. Printed in U.S.A.

THE CHALLENGE OF DEFINITIONS IN COMPARATIVE EDUCATION

I have been asked by the editor of this journal to specify the problems a teacher or writer in the field of comparative education will face.

So, here is a list of my encounters with certain predicaments which, I am sure, are not merely my own, but a continuous challenge to anyone who teaches education, especially in its comparative aspects, and is not satisfied with presenting to his students a mere narrative of the process, progress, and the methods of schooling.

First. When and where does education begin? In the mother's womb, in the consciously or unconsciously felt climate of the family and community, or in the first formal meeting between the teacher and the curious, but slightly suspicious first grader? Or, as some of us may believe, does *real* education begin with marriage and raising one's own offspring, or in the first political meeting, or the first attempt to earn one's own living? And where and when does education end? With death, with beginning senility, or with the last academic examination which, if things proceed as they have during the past decades, will move closer and closer to the day of retirement?

Second. Are those agencies which we generally call "educational", really the most influential in the educational enterprise of man? In all seriousness one may ask the question whether, despite all big moral phrases, the schools are not much more informational and instructional than truly educational institutions—*Unterrichtsanstalten* rather than centers of *Bildung*? And if I am not mistaken, most young people go through a phase when the "gang", whether good or bad, has more influence on them than the family. The companions, not the parents and teachers, may decide about a young person's future success or disaster—which is the reason why Locke and all the others interested in the breeding of the gentleman

are extremely concerned, if not snobbish, about the right choice of the young man's or lady's friends.

Third. There is the historical problem. When we try to explain even our contemporary education, how far should we trace it down? Even if Johnny Smith, perhaps even his teacher, do not know it, they have been morally educated by the Jewish prophets, intellectually by the Greeks, religiously, be it even in protest, by the Christian tradition, humanely by various forms of humanism, and rationally by the Enlightenment and the scientific movement.

Fourth. If this is true, we are confronted with an embarrassing choice. Either we identify the study of education with the old "pedagogy", or we no longer know the boundaries between education and the history of human culture. The first solution puts us into a state of intellectual poverty, the second into a state of *embarras de richesse*. And worse than that, it exposes us to the danger of dilettantism, or it makes us, at least in some areas, dependent on secondary sources. The moment one ventures to compare various civilizations the dilemma becomes still worse.

Fifth. There emerges, in addition, a methodological problem. Do we really "compare", i.e. do we have a *tertium comparationis* to which to relate the items under discussion, or do we, as so many studies in comparative education, comparative literature, and comparative government, merely juxtapose a more or less arbitrary number of individual data? In other words, before we begin with the comparative epic we have first to find out what the various national systems of education have in common, for only then we can say in which respect they are different and why. And the answer to the "why" is, after all, the purpose of comparative education.

Sixth. I have used the term "national" sys-

tems. But what is a "nation"? What is "national", especially in education? And is there something like a "national character"? Differences exist, no one will doubt. But are they due to "character", whatever that is, which is inherent in a nation's mental makeup, or are they but incidental, or perhaps merely accidental? Many decisive trends in a people's history have come about by chance: A battle was lost in consequence of a general's blunder; an emperor died too early or too late; or there was not sufficient technical progress. Think what would have happened if the German scientists—who, after all, had the idea—had produced the atomic bomb

earlier than their American competitors.

All this is extremely disconcerting for a conscientious scholar. Nevertheless, the task of comparative education has to be done, because in this time of growing international contact we cannot afford the luxury of ignorance about the education and the ideals which other nations try to commit to the next generation, and we must also know something about the methods they apply in the process.

And if the task seems sometimes too great, we have at least one redeeming comfort: it is most certainly not boring.

ROBERT ULICH

PROBLEMS OF EDUCATIONAL POLICY IN COMMUNIST CHINA¹

To visit China again after ten years is immensely exciting. In 1947 things were at a low ebb. For fifty years the land had been ravaged by civil strife and foreign war. Armies had marched backwards and forwards, brigands had robbed and plundered at will. The people were badly fed, medical services were insufficient, clothing and material commodities of all kinds were lacking. Whatever criticism may be urged against the present administration or its political and social doctrine, it has at least brought peace to the land and given firm if harsh leadership. Crops have been sown and harvested; factories kept busy. In consequence, there has been a spectacular improvement in the standard of life. There is no evidence of food shortage, people are decently though drably dressed, there are no beggars. Everywhere both men and women toil with tremendous energy. The amount of building work going on in Peking, Sian or Chungking leaves far behind anything I have seen in Germany, England or Japan. This applies

particularly to the erection of schools and colleges: the new ones are plain, overcrowded but at least they are solid and not unpleasing to look at.

I was the first professional educationist from the West to visit China—or at least the North and Centre—for many years. In each of the major cities, the staffs of the education faculties of the Universities were gathered and I was asked to speak about educational developments in Europe and the U.S.A. Afterwards came the questions—we often went on with the discussion for four or five hours. Had I allowed myself to think of the importance and responsibility of the task laid upon me in thus defending a liberal and democratic philosophy of education in the midst of a communist country, I would have been overwhelmed and silenced. In point of fact, I must say I thoroughly enjoyed the arguments, which were always conducted with scrupulous fairness and good humor.

I have no space here to describe nor to analyze fully what I saw in China. I must restrict myself to one point only—general policy. In a lengthy interview with the Di-

¹ This article is a result of a four week visit to China in May 1957. The visit encompassed Peking, Sian-Fu, Chungking, and Hankow.

rector of the General Office of the Ministry of Education in Peking I asked him to tell me what were the chief problems which he and his colleagues faced. He listed four:

1. The education of the national minorities;
2. The organization of the middle (secondary) stage of education;
3. The curriculum and content of the middle stage;
4. The popularization and democratization of education.

My own interpretation of these points is as follows:—

1. About 94 per cent of the population of China belongs to the dominant Han culture. The remaining 36 million people consist of distinct nationalities such as the Li, the Miao, the Chuangs, etc. All these speak their own language, wear distinctive dress, eat special food and so on. They do not think themselves Han. A fundamental point of communist philosophy is that such nationalities must be granted full cultural autonomy—this being the way by which their loyalty to the regime can be best assured. Furthermore, a policy of equalization is always adopted; that is, a great effort is made to bring the economic and cultural level of minority groups up to that of the dominant majority. The application of these two principles implies establishing many schools, colleges and even universities in backward and remote regions. Teachers and professors have to be selected and trained, books written and printed and so forth. For the Chinese Republic this task is particularly important because geological exploration is leading to the discovery of vast resources of minerals, coal and oil precisely in regions like Inner Mongolia and Kokonar, which are the dwelling places of the minorities.

2. The present system is a 6-3-3 system, like that of Japan and some parts of the U.S.A. Both the Junior Middle and Senior Middle schools are "general" schools. On the

whole, public opinion favors (as in Europe and Japan) the development of general or academic secondary education, leading to clerical and administrative employment. Should the Ministry meet this demand or should it react against it, endeavoring to provide vocational and technical middle schools? If so, how should these be organized?

3. As almost everywhere, the traditional curriculum leans toward literary and linguistic studies. Furthermore, teaching tends to be 'teacher-centred'—chalk and talk. Such a content and such methods are not likely to favor the rapid development of modern industry. How can a fundamental re-orientation be promoted?

Furthermore, it is evident to the advisors of the Ministry that the curriculum should be closely connected with the productive life of the different regions—that it ought to be different in a rice-growing village, a Southern city, a small Northern town. But how can centralized administration, finance and control be combined with academic (curriculum) decentralization? There is no tradition among teachers or among trained college staffs which would encourage them to try experiments in curriculum construction.

4. Should one attempt to develop universal mass primary education? Or should one concentrate available resources upon the middle schools, upon teacher training, upon technical education? Faith in the power and value of schooling is tremendous—every village and every hamlet is asking for a school. Yet this is a demand for consumer goods: wisdom would counsel concentration upon producer goods.

Another point: the overwhelming majority (over 80 per cent) of college students come from the middle classes; that is, their parents are teachers, civil servants, professional men, former capitalists or landowners. This is to be expected—but the authorities would like to see a much larger percentage of students from the ranks of the peasants and of the industrial proletariat. How can

they get students of the right quality from the simple huts of illiterate peasants?

It is evident that any government, communist or not, would have to tackle all four of these problems. Realizing this, I asked the Director to try to specify what he considered to be the principal effects of communist philosophy on the approach to education policy in general. He answered that this was an exceedingly difficult question which he hesitated to deal with. Tentatively, however, he thought he might mention four points:

First: That they now insisted much more than previously upon quality of work and upon the ideal of social service. They tried to make every student feel that they were enjoying a great privilege by being given access to education. They were incurring a debt to society which they would have to repay. They should be glad to accept any job, any task anywhere, allocated to them by the government.

Secondly: That they now laid vastly more weight than previously upon the teaching of science and of technology. These subjects had central importance in all their schemes.

Thirdly: That they were deliberately attempting to follow a policy of social equalization, trying to raise the level of underprivileged classes and opening to them the chance of getting knowledge and learning. Previous governments had attempted to restrict access to the universities, favoring the children of the well-to-do.

Fourthly: That they now tried to develop in all pupils at all levels a spirit of cheerful, enthusiastic optimism and a feeling for the brotherhood of all mankind.

I will not comment upon these points. I shall content myself by saying once more

that all the problems raised by the Director would have to be considered by any government, whatever its political doctrine might be. What distinguishes the new regime from those that preceded it is the energy, decisiveness and ruthlessness with which the problems are being tackled.²

J. A. LAUWERYS

² The following are the selected readings on education in Communist China since 1950: Lindsay, Michael, *Notes on Educational Problems in Communist China* (New York: Institute of Pacific Relations, 1950); Thomas, S. B., "Recent Educational Policy in China," *Pacific Affairs* (March, 1950); Chieh, Kuo Hui, *Culture and Education in New China* (Peking: Foreign Language Press, 1951). (Also earlier editions.); Chen, T. H., "Education and Propaganda in Communist China," *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* (September, 1951); Priestley, K. E., "China," *Yearbook of Education 1952* (London: Evans 1952). (Also articles in earlier issues.); Shih, L., "China's New Educational System," *School and Society* (March, 29, 1952); E. I., "Education in Communist China," *World Today* (June, 1952). (Also articles in earlier issues.); Chung, Shih, *Higher Education in Communist China* (Hong Kong: The Union Research Institute, 1953); Farrington, B., "Education in the New China," *Journal of Education* (London: January, 1953); Chi, Tung-wei, *Education for the Proletariat in Communist China* (Hong Kong: The Union Research Institute, 1954); Wang, Charles K. S., *The Control of Teachers in Communist China: A Socio-Political Study* (Texas: Air Force Personnel and Training Research Center, Lackland Air Force Base, 1955); Chen, T. H., "Salient Characteristics of Education in Communist China," *Education* (February, 1956); Chen, T. H., "Education in the Chinese Revolution," *Current History* (January, 1957). (Also articles in earlier issues.); Chen, T. H., "Collective Learning in Communist China's Universities," *Far Eastern Survey* (January, 1957); Lauwerys, J. A., "China's Educational Expansion," *Times Educational Supplement* (June 27, 1957). (Also articles in earlier issues.)

COMPARATIVE STUDY IN RELIGION AND EDUCATION

Comparative religion is one of the oldest, best-established, and most thoroughly explored fields in the modern study of religion. The comparative approach has long been attractive to the enquiring university student as he seeks to widen his perspective beyond that of his family and tradition and perchance to find a faith he can truly call his own. Professional theologians, philosophers, and social scientists have also found in comparative studies of religion rich sources of insight and fruitful suggestions for research. The abundant and constantly expanding literature in comparative religion is concrete evidence of the vitality and wide appeal of this field of study.

The paragraphs which follow are written in the hope that those concerned with comparative education may find illuminating a consideration of the motives and methods of those who practice the sister discipline of comparative religion. The family resemblance is surely obvious. Both religion and education are pervasive cultural phenomena, claiming pertinence to all domains of human activity. Both are dedicated to the optimum development of persons. Both rest upon convictions about value priorities. Both generate institutional structures appropriate for the embodiment of these values in personality and in society. In the light of these basic similarities between religion and education, one should expect the approach to comparative religion to be pertinent and suggestive for the student of comparative education.

Every scholarly endeavor serves some human purpose. What are the motives for comparing the religions of mankind? What interest stimulates the study of comparative religion? At the risk of over-simplification five major concerns which have sparked the comparative study of religion are here suggested. These are arranged in what may be taken roughly as the chronological order of their dominance—though doubtless all

five have always been present in varying degrees and proportions and remain even to the present day.

The first motive is that of the missionary—to propagate a faith. The missionary in confronting people of other faiths must come to terms with religions other than his own. As an apologist, moreover, he must show that the other faiths are inferior or false. Many studies in comparative religion have had an apologetic motive. For example, a widely-used book, *The World's Living Religions*, by Robert E. Hume, after describing each religion compares it with Christianity, to the obvious advantage of the latter. The clear objective of such a study is to convince the reader of the superiority of the religion to which the author is committed.

A second motive, essentially as apologetic as the first, is to undermine the claims of all religions by showing their mutual contradictions at every point of belief and practice and by analyzing the natural and human conditions which have determined the content of the several faiths. Frazer's *The Golden Bough* is a classic example. A. Eustace Haydon's *Biography of the Gods* and the more recent book by Homer Smith on *Man and His Gods* are further illustrations of comparative studies devoted to the naturalizing of the supernatural. Quite apart from these deliberate attempts to dissolve traditional faith with the acids of positivism, the study of comparative religion inevitably subjects the faith of the unsophisticated to a severe test. This is particularly true in our Western civilization, which has developed in religion a tradition of the True Believer in the One Way, for whom the comparative insight into the many ways of mankind is largely alien.

A third purpose in studying comparative religion is simply to get understanding. The goal is neither to promote one religion nor to discredit all of them, but to gain a broad,

sympathetic and impartial view of the many types of creed and rite to which men subscribe. One may find intellectual satisfaction in such a detached, objective survey of the profusion of faiths. Whether full objectivity and neutrality are either possible or desirable is a debatable question. Still, there is a meaningful sense in which the motive of comparative study may be simply enrichment of understanding. The book which in the opinion of many is the best available college text in comparative religion, John B. Noss: *Man's Religions*, is one illustration among many of works clearly dedicated to objective understanding. The monumental and compendious *Histoire Generale des Religions*, edited by Gorce and Mortier, is another example. In fact, all comparative studies guided by the ideals of pure scholarship fall under this motive.

A fourth motive for the comparative study of religion is to find a more adequate personal faith. The cult of objectivity has recently been subjected to increasing criticism. Many academic people have come to doubt the value or even the possibility of pure intellectual detachment. They see every person as living by some faith or other, and they view scholarly inquiry, including comparative studies, as a means of clarifying or transforming that faith. From this standpoint, the purpose in comparative inquiry is not primarily to satisfy intellectual curiosity, but to improve one's personal life-commitments. While any competently done comparative inquiries may serve this purpose, some are more clearly dedicated to it than others. Examples are Hutchison and Martin: *Ways of Faith*, J. D. Butler: *Four Philosophies and their Practice in Education and Religion*, and perhaps E. A. Burtt: *Man Seeks the Divine*.

A fifth objective in the comparative study of religion grows out of social and political concern rather than the search for personal faith. In a world which has become a neighborhood the problem of the conflict of faiths is crucial. Is a world civilization possible? How may the competing claims

of different ways of life be harmonized? Comparative studies have both sharpened the issue and suggested bases for a resolution. Representative of this concern are such recent works as Frederick Spiegelberg: *Living Religions of the World*, Philip Ashby: *The Conflict of Religions*, Arnold Toynbee: *An Historian's Approach to Religion*, and W. E. Hocking: *The Coming World Civilization*.

These are some of the motives which underlie the study of comparative religion. They may serve to suggest the kinds of interests which also actuate students of comparative education. It is important for workers in any field of inquiry to understand as clearly as possible what their purposes really are. Disinterested understanding, even if it should exist (as it probably does not and cannot), is not the sole legitimate objective for comparative education. It is important to become aware of the use of comparative studies for such diverse purposes as these: to promote a preferred educational ideal, to undermine the exclusive claims of all educational systems, to enlarge understanding of other ways of teaching, to develop more adequate educational objectives, or to advance education for intercultural harmony. Since each motive has its characteristic influence on the selection and organization of the materials studied, it must be taken into account in making informed judgments about any given inquiry.

Comparative religion may be relevant to comparative education not only with respect to motives but also with regard to methods. A review of the literature of comparative religion suggests that there are several distinct dimensions of comparative method. For each dimension there is a choice between contrasting types of study. The precise nature of the method used in any given comparative study can be designated by stating which combination of choices from the various pairs of alternatives applies.

The first dimension of comparative method involves the choice between treat-

ing each religion as a whole or considering certain aspects of each religion in succession. In support of the holistic approach is the fact that religions are comprehensive life-orientations which can only be properly understood and compared in their integrity and that the comparison of aspects such as institutional structure or beliefs about the divine distorts the analysis by severing the parts from the living whole. On the other hand, discrimination of significant aspects facilitates detailed comparison in ways not possible in the mere juxtaposition of whole faith-systems. Most comparative religion today favors the presentation of the whole. Vergilius Ferm: *Living Schools of Religion* is a symposium in which the essential features of each religion are treated by a representative of the faith. The holistic approach has also been followed in the preparation of a number of series of books on the religions of mankind, as for example in the *World Religions* series of Hutchinson's university library. An instance of the less usual non-holistic aspect-approach is E. O. James's study of *The Concept of Deity* from the standpoint of the sociology of religion.

The second dimension of comparative method concerns depth. Some comparisons are relatively superficial, involving such matters as numbers of members and unanalyzed statements of beliefs. Recent journalistic efforts such as *Life Magazine's* generally excellent series on the world's religions and the series on the religions of America in *Look Magazine* illustrate comparative method at a relatively superficial level, while three recent volumes edited by Kenneth Morgan on Hinduism, Buddhism, and Islam, each containing articles by leading scholars of the respective faiths, exemplify a much more profound type of analysis. Superficial comparisons deal with the external and explicit aspects of each religion. Comparisons in depth are concerned with interpretations, meanings, and relationships.

A third dimension of comparative study

has to do with the source of the concepts used in making comparisons. This dimension applies when the comparison goes beyond a juxtaposition of descriptive accounts of each religion. The conceptual framework within which the comparison is made may be drawn from one of the religions being compared, or from a third religion, or from a system of thought outside the religious field altogether. Thus, Albert Schweitzer in *Christianity and the Religions of the World* uses the frame of reference of Christian ethical monotheism in comparing Christianity with the religions of India. A. C. Bouquet in his *Comparative Religion* uses Christian categories in comparing non-Christian religions. The epochal comparative study of G. van der Leeuw: *Religion in Essence and Manifestation* uses a conceptual scheme drawn from a phenomenology largely independent of traditional religious thought. Similarly, Joachim Wach chiefly uses sociological concepts in his *Sociology of Religion*. One of the best modern thematic studies of religion, using a variety of frameworks—historical, sociological, philosophical, and psychological—is Winston King's compendious *Introduction to Religion*.

A fourth pair of contrasts in comparative method concerns evaluation. Some studies aim at complete impartiality, while others are designed to show the merits and defects of the religions compared, according to some scale of values. The series of accounts by representatives of the several faiths (e.g., Kenneth Morgan's trilogy) and the purely descriptive and scientific-analytical types of study (e.g., Wach) on the whole seek to avoid evaluation, while the interpretive accounts (e.g., Noss, King, Schweitzer) contain explicit value judgments. It is a question, of course, whether any comparative study can avoid implicit evaluation, and whether it may not be better to acknowledge the judgments implied than to allow them to remain covert.

These four dimensions of method in comparative religion are no doubt evident also

in comparative education. They have been outlined here in further support of the thesis that the study of comparative religion may have significance for students of comparative education. The experience in comparative religion indicates that there is no single sovereign method of comparative study. There are several possible methods, defined by different combinations and dimensions—whole or part, description or interpretation, source of concepts, and degree of evaluation—each of which may have its appropriate uses.

Comparative religion and comparative education are thus closely related in motives and methods. But the connection is even more intimate than already suggested. Religion, conceived in a fundamental sense, is the basic scheme of life-orientation of individuals and societies. It is the framework of ultimate commitments by which personal and social existence is governed. Sometimes the operating faith is one of the traditional organized religions. Still more often it is a total system of belief and action not ordinarily labelled religious—such as conservatism, hedonism, scientism, psychologism, estheticism, or marxism—which nonetheless serves as a controlling faith. These religious and quasi-religious systems are manifest in every aspect of life, including

education. Aims, attitudes, and methods in education inevitably reflect the fundamental faith-systems. It follows that comparative education can profit from a comparison of the religious outlooks of which different programs and ideals of education are one important kind of evidence.

According to this view, comparative religion and comparative education are not merely sister disciplines whose motives and methods yield fruitful suggestions for one another. Nor is the problem of religion in education simply one of many special topics to be considered in comparative perspective. All mankind lives according to some pattern of ultimate conviction. It is the task of comparative religion, broadly conceived, to inquire into the several faiths which actually rule the thoughts, affections, and deeds of men. The consideration of these faiths provides a most illuminating context in which to understand more profoundly the internal and external relationships of the corresponding educational concerns. In the final analysis, the comparative study of education rests upon a comparison of ultimate faiths, and the comparative study of man's religions may in turn find fruitful exemplification in the varieties of educational thought and its application to school practice.

PHILIP H. PHENIX

RECENT DEVELOPMENTS IN THE SOVIET SCHOOLS¹

In comparative research there is never an end to collection of bibliographies. Since the first part of this article was published in June, several new writings have appeared and several previously omitted have come to notice.

¹ I am grateful to Mr. Charles E. Hizette, a Russian speaking graduate student at Teachers College for assistance in perusing most recent Soviet sources in preparation of this part of the article.

Most significant perhaps is the growing availability of Soviet sources in the English language. In addition to publications of the Foreign Languages Publishing House in Moscow, such as the documents of the Twentieth Party Congress, and Makarenko's and Kalinin's writings on education, the *International Yearbook of Education* (1956) contains an article on USSR by L. V. Doubrovina; the *Yearbook of Education* 1956 has one on "Technical Education in USSR," by A. F. Shalin; and *Fundamental and Adult*

Education (vol. IX /1957/ no. 3) has "Adult Education in the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics," by N. Naumov. The *Anglo-Soviet Journal* published in England by the Society for Cultural Relations with the USSR, contains also several articles on Soviet education substantially in the form of reprints from Soviet sources. As an example one might mention a symposium on "Soviet Teaching Problems" and (in the same issue) D. Levin's "Boarding Schools in the USSR" (v. XVII, no. 3, Autumn 1956).

Writings from other sources are also forthcoming in a steady stream. The *Bulletin of the Institute for the Study of the USSR* has three new notes: in the April issue, D. Burg, "Soviet Youth's Attitude to the Communist Regime" (v. IV, no. 4, 1957), and in the May issue, by the same author "Soviet Youth's Opposition to the Communist Regime" and S. Wolk "Soviet Fine Arts and the Recent Congress of Soviet Artists" (v. IV, no. 5, 1957). *Institute of International Education News Bulletin* has two articles: J. A. Armstrong "A View of Soviet Universities" and G. Gibian "Literature and Universities in Soviet Russia" (v. 32, no. 8, May 1957). Other items of interest include: Ivan D. London "Towards a Realistic Appraisal of Soviet Science" *Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists* (v. XII, no. 5, May 1957); and Robert A. Feldmesser "Social Status and Access to Higher Education: A Comparison of the United States and the Soviet Union," *Harvard Educational Review* (v. XXVII, no. 2, Spring 1957).

The June article dealt with the number of university students, the first of the five important current issues in Soviet education. The present article is devoted to the other issues: the unrest of youth; the boarding schools; compulsory full secondary education; and changes in school curriculum.

The unrest among the Soviet youth

In the matter of the unrest of Soviet youth, a difference of opinion clearly divides the experts. Insisting that Soviet edu-

cation is a remarkably successful weapon of political indoctrination, George Counts once remarked, with incontrovertible logic, that youth unrest has always existed. What has changed is the opportunity to hear about it in the West. Opposing this view Allan Dulles and after him Harold Salisbury predict that widening educational opportunities will bolster the stamina of the Soviet common man to resist and ultimately destroy the system of oppression imposed upon him in his name.

Here, indeed, is a thorny question. The heckling to which even left-wing Americans were subjected at the recent Youth Congress in Moscow bears out Count's thesis. So do reports of juvenile delinquency most often quoted in support of the contrary view. The adoption of jazz, foreign dress, and other features of the "decadent" West, may be a rejection of Soviet pseudo-puritanism by the young. But "a curious feature of their defense of America is that they have a completely false impression of the United States, quite in keeping with the Soviet propaganda claim that it is a country ruled by gangsters and venal politicians, while the workers live in obedience and poverty." (Burg, April article, p. 45). On the whole, there is no doubt that a substantial proportion of Soviet youth has grown up in the atmosphere of complete acceptance of Soviet ideals, or, at least, has learned how to live with them.

Yet there is no doubt that the unrest of the Soviet youth, whether always latent, or only now germinating, is of substantial proportions. At the very least the problem is real enough and extensive enough to be alarming to the Soviet authorities. It is true that student unrest is a perpetual feature of most non-Anglosaxon societies from Poland to Burma, from Spain to Argentina. But the Soviet case is special. All over the world the causes of youth ferment are economic or political. The uncertainties of the market for university graduates after hardships of study undertaken often on the margin of material subsistence, have turned student

bodies into particularly inflammable material. Politically, too, they are brought up not on practical but on theoretical fare, not on pragmatic attitudes but on a sense of duty to patriotic ideals, not on compromise but on fiery convictions. It is inevitable that the gap between economic and political expectations, and stark social realities, should produce shock, resentment and protest. The universities, at the graduation from which these realities begin, very naturally become a scene of confrontation and explosion.

But these features of university life apply neither to the Anglosaxon world, nor wholly to the Soviet Union. It is true that too little cash, insufficient food, poor lodgings, uncertainty as to continuation of scholarships, and long hours necessary to prepare for competitive examinations, all these set against the background of adjustment of rural and working class youth to challenges of urban and intellectual life, have combined to make Soviet students "jumpy." Hence student riots in 1940 when the reintroduction of fees in higher education was understood to mean the return of social discrimination in education. But as against this the expanding economic opportunities provided and provide a steady antidote. Even the otherwise deplored compulsory three year job assignment of graduates has been defended by refugee students as a measure of economic security contrasting favorably with placement insecurities of a laissez-faire West. The college students, as against those Soviet youngsters, to whom the opportunities for college education are now increasingly denied, have little cause to feel an economic dissatisfaction.

It is also true that police terror, the zig-zag falsehoods of the party line, and the abuses of power by the growing bureaucracy always irked the Soviet youngsters famous for their ideological dedication. Hence the history of riots, from the disturbances at the fall of Trotsky, to the anti-stalinization demonstrations in Tiflis. But again the blinding nature of the monolythic faith, and the vision of ultimate socialist

panacea have provided an escape mechanism particularly attractive to dreaming visionaries. It is remarkable how quickly, the seemingly convulsing changes such as the literary thaw, or the Hungarian awakening, were drained of freshness and vitality by the main stream of Soviet political orthodoxy. On the whole the regime provided students with political stability which seriously minimized the chances of any but sporadic unrest.

No one can tell whether political stability or economic security is less now in the Soviet Union than it was in Stalin's era. If economically there is less outlet for ambitions of the college oriented youth the general upgrading of the nature of occupations and incomes has removed much of the former grimness in the struggle for subsistence. If political changes of leadership, party orientation, and satellite attitudes, are somewhat more perplexing, the disappearance of police terror must have been reassuring. There is as yet no proven general instability. But there is rapid change necessitating a constant readjustment of attitudes. And since the communist doctrine deliberately failed to provide outlets for such adaptation, there is small wonder that the mere fact of change has thrown large numbers of Soviet youth out of gear with the official system.

Broadly speaking there are three symptoms of this maladjustment.

There is first of all in evidence the surfeit of indoctrination which rendered stale even the most idealistic of communist propositions. It was inevitable that society built on enforced altruism, would end up giving it no more than lip service. Even before the war, refugees from Koestler to Guzenko, sought to depict the eclipse of the idealistic revolutionary by the careerist bureaucrat. Such careerists have recently multiplied. It is against them that Kruschov's move to decentralize heavy industries is supposed to be directed. Soviet writers, with Dudintsev's *Not by Bread Alone* in the vanguard, sought to fight them in the brief and now largely

defunct rebellion. By consulting one of Raymond Bauer's *Nine Soviet Portraits* one can see how easily such careerists operate within schools. It is they who are the cause of the present campaign to revamp the Komsomol. The boarding school movement, too, is another attempt to give a new lease of life to their moribund idealism. From the hooligan and speculator heirs of the *besprizornye* and the golden youth *stilyagi*, to the cold blooded Party activists, the ranks of unconcerned cynics continue to threaten the fortunes of the Soviet experiment.

There are secondly the swelling ranks of "neo-bolsheviks" who wish to restore Marxian purity by proscribing the perverted leaders of the present regime. Before the war most young intellectuals were rather self-conscious about their prerevolutionary bourgeois connections. This placed the authorities at an advantage as mentors and guardians of true Marxist doctrine. But the present young generation is "100 per cent" Soviet. It feels completely secure in its own interpretation of the communist heritage. Thus it does not hesitate to ask awkward questions when faced with bureaucratic mismanagement, the emerging class structure and, armed suppression of satellites. Every article on Soviet Youth is filled with instances of their protest. The authenticity of the textbooks is queried in Taganrog, a speaker is heckled in Moscow, critics of modern art are reviled in Leningrad, fault finders become vocal in Azerbaidzhan, students riot in the Ural. The list by now is almost infinite. Perhaps the most trenchant example appeared in *Encounter* which published "A Letter from a Moscow Student" (June, 1957, pp. 72-74) describing the November 1956 riot at Lomonosov University. "Hasn't party bureaucracy" the student asked, "although it is not formally entitled to own the means of production of the community, become an exploiting party in the original Marxist sense, through the practical control it exercises over the various branches of production, in that it determines

the latter's utilization and controls employment of workers and salaries? And is it not admissible or even necessary, to apply the old Marxist weapon of classcombat—i.e. the general strike—against it too?" We have not yet heard the last of the slogan "Socialist Revolution against the Pseudo-Socialist State," which supplies the clearest clue to the present state of mind of the young Soviet people.

The last group of dissatisfied youngsters contains the outright enemies of the regime. This group has been disenchanted by the failure of the Marxian prophecy that predicted the doom of capitalism. The West's prosperity and its democratic attractions remain a subject of interest and a matter for nostalgia. The currency given to the view, formulated in this country by N. Timasheff in *The Great Retreat*, that the present Soviet industrial advances would have occurred anyhow, had the capitalist system been allowed to operate at the prerevolutionary pace, continues to spread dissatisfaction. Coupled with the known abuses of the system these views make up the pattern of anti-soviet feelings. As a result several groups of students succeeded recently in inaugurating and maintaining clandestine newspapers directed against the regime. Five such newspapers were discovered and liquidated during last year alone. Other groups have mobilized throughout the country in a network of anti-regime discussion clubs. Written or oral communications from individuals and groups begin to reach Western periodicals and Western travelers with increasing frequency. Such groups also supply defectors that go to swell the ranks of anti-Soviet Russian emigres. It is only a pity that, by all accounts, this group has hardly matched in strength the other two.

The information about the political dissatisfaction of Soviet youth now available seems to confine it to persons of college age. The economic and social unrest, on the other hand, seems to affect adolescents in secondary schools. This breakdown is directly correlated to the school situation.

The continued opportunity for political discussion in the colleges coupled with good economic prospects for graduates have tended to magnify the former. By contrast, the purging of the school curriculum of political matters on one side, and economic insecurity induced by increasingly restrictive college admission policies, on the other, has rendered the schools vulnerable to the latter. The central cause of the present unrest, however, is common to all levels of education. It is the continuous insistence in education on the priority of altruistic ideals. But a mass production of an idealistic society is possible only under terroristic pressure or religious exaltation. The death of Stalin deprived the Russians of the first, and the conduct of their leaders has made the second difficult. Since there is as yet no widespread recognition that enlightened self-interest might after all be a better cement of an open social structure, the Soviet youth are doomed to bewilderment between the alternatives of attempting to reach pure Marxian religion or of seeking despairing refuge in cynical egotism.

Boarding Schools

The institution of boarding school has been one of the means to combat youth unrest. The project is now one year old. During that year, in spite of grievous building difficulties, probably some 250 schools with some 50,000 students (of the originally planned 285 schools with 70,000 students) have come into being, more than half of them in the Russian Republic. The schools comprise now only grades 1 to 7, and are small, many numbering no more than 150 children. Their experimental nature has enabled their teachers to exercise a good deal of free initiative in organization and programs. The schools are coeducational and are organized on a vertical rather than an age group principle, with elected leaders from the senior class at the head of each unit. The children do their own cleaning and the general attempt is to blend harmoniously the mental and the manual tasks and

to build the whole curriculum on the basis of whole-hearted dedication to collective ideals. Most available accounts describe Moscow schools, but there are scattered references to others, for instance, to one in Kishinev, Moldavia (cf. *Current Digest of Soviet Press* v. 9, no. 2, July 3, 1957, pp. 40-41).

The reexamination of Krushchov's announcement on boarding schools to the Twentieth Party Congress confirms the then prevalent opinion that the measure was originally designed as a concession to the new Soviet upper class. This was the time of anti-Stalin revelations when no stone could be left unturned to solicit maximum support of the old cadres for the new regime. It was also a logical response to pressure for privileged education inevitable in a system that was about to embark on extension of secondary schools to all. Several references in Krushchov's speech overtly deny elitist intentions, yet he compared the new schools to the Corps de Pages of the Tsarist times, not to the Soviet prototypes of military Suvorov and Nakhimov schools, or the orphan and delinquent schools established by Makarenko. In a system moving anew towards abolition of all fees, they alone were to charge to a fairly high albeit graduated scale. And in a society which never hesitates to use means of assignment and direction these schools alone were to be open only to children whose parents requested admission.

But if the original intentions were elitist, the actual practice so far does not substantiate the charge. It is quite possible that the suspicion that greeted Krushchov's announcement, has made the Soviet government particularly anxious to prove that they had no such intentions. The schools established as a result of the first year experiment contain a substantial proportion, in some a majority of children, from deprived homes. The presence of these children, coupled with theoretical uncertainties of what precisely to teach, and the failure to assign lavish funds for physical plants, sug-

gests that they are not now intended to serve an hereditary elite.

But this only complicates the problem of further interpretation. The schools not only are not reserved for the hereditary elite, they do not seem to be elite schools at all. The second possibility, that they would train the democratically selected but nevertheless elite cadres destined to revitalize the apathetic Party rank and file, is also not borne out by their present character. They seem to be neither selective for ability, nor geared to training for high administrative posts. Each student "collective," the basic form of boarding school organization, is founded on an almost exaggerated comprehensive principle and contains "an equal number of children of each age, an equal number of boys and girls, good, average and weak children—both intellectually and physically, well disciplined together with poorly disciplined." (*Sovetskaya Pedagogika*, February 1957, p. 26). Similarly so far the official emphasis has been not so much on high scholastic standards, as on the equal inclusion of manual education. In some schools this is off to a slow start. But in others, efforts to acquire orchards, to establish workshops, to learn trades and mechanical skills, to cultivate arts and sports, and to monitor younger children, have been substantial. Although the majority of pupils is said to belong to the communist youth organizations, as yet no clear indication is given that they are destined to be trained specially for high Party positions.

Two other plausible interpretations remain. One is that these schools are a pilot project for an eventual wholesale conversion of the Soviet school system to a boarding type of education. Such an interpretation would accord with Soviet theory of the early twenties towards the precedents of which the Soviet writers are now increasingly referring. It would also tally with the dissatisfaction which the authorities evince for the educative influence of both the home and the present system of day schools. For these reasons several Soviet

educators have made public statements in favor of boarding. But if boarding is to combat the influence of the home, it seems strange that so much say should have been specifically left to parents. Not only is the application for admission entirely within parents discretion. Parent committees are said to be cooperating closely in program formation and to be quite vocal, for instance, against the mixing of children of different ages. The considerable official emphasis on student self-government is also not always conducive to a development of a unified program that might serve as a model for all schools. Tensions between the children and their elected monitors have led to removals of the latter and to general vacillations. Finally the teachers assigned to boarding schools have not been, with the exception of short courses now organized, specially trained. It is probably the vested interests of the day schools that have caused lukewarmness and sluggishness with which the educators responsible for organizing the boarding schools have been charged on occasions. As means of rehabilitation of previously miseducated youth these schools possess a suspiciously large number of the same ingredients that caused the original deterioration.

Thus although the official goal of striving to create places for revitalized altruistic training of Soviet citizens cannot be denied, the most probable net effect of this reform will be only greater diversification. The boarding schools are simply destined to serve the growing decentralization of Soviet society as it recoils from its monopolistic pattern to some future, uncertain, but hoped for plurality. The growing numerical scope of Soviet education is forcing that society as it has forced the American to increase the availability of educational choices to suit different needs. Thus conceived, this movement is an answer to critics of American education who charge it with too much diversification and who cast longing glances over the ocean to more uniform and centralized schemes.

Compulsory Secondary Education

Both for economic and political reasons the announcement of the introduction of compulsory schooling until the age of 17 seemed a logical continuation of Soviet tradition. But so far the announcement that by 1960 all youngsters will be completing a unified secondary school has been greeted with justifiable scepticism. The extension of the school age to 14, decreed before the war, was not claimed to have been attained until 1947, and some Soviet pronouncements make one doubt whether this claim has even now been successfully accomplished. (*Uchitel'skaya Gazeta*, 1 Dec. 1956 p. 2. Report from the Ministry of Education for R.S.F.S.R.). The original promise by the Nineteenth Party Congress that universal secondary education will be definitely introduced by 1960, gave way to the announcement of the Twentieth Congress that it will be introduced *in the main*, in urban and rural localities. Most significantly the original plan for secondary comprehensive education for all tends to give way to a concept of two stream secondary education. The professional secondary schools, greatly increased in number, are to serve the majority

of youth while the old type academic three senior grades are to remain selective and college oriented. One must also take note of the fact that in junior grades of the Soviet schools, the children are on a three hour day, in middle grades on a 4 hour day, and only over 16 years of age do they attend for 5 hours a day, and 6 hours for one day a week. (*Bulletin of the International Bureau of Education* No. 114, p. 22). Although Soviet sources state that this is so in order to reserve the afternoons for optional study, the fact is that over 100,000 schools (more than half) operated in 1955-56 on two shifts while some 1400 operated on three shifts. (*Kul'turnoye Stroitel'stvo*, 1956, p. 168. Most of the figures that follow are also from this source pp. 122, 172). For all these reasons the outlook for universal full secondary education is not bright.

The rapid increase of the senior secondary school population remains, however, a plain fact. Whereas the number of children in classes 1 to 7 has fallen between 1950-51 and 1955-56 from some 32 to some 23 million, the number of pupils in classes 8 to 10 has increased from 1½ to over 5 million. The full figures are as follows:

Soviet School Population 1950-56

	<i>class 1-4</i>	<i>class 5-7</i>	<i>class 8-10</i>
1950-51	19,670,796	12,031,146	1,495,981
1951-52	16,443,378	13,540,562	2,347,873
1952-53	13,394,381	14,087,403	3,346,237
1953-54	12,106,037	13,476,692	4,496,464
1954-55	12,663,288	11,615,528	5,144,710
1955-56	13,579,460	9,268,174	5,253,070

These figures reveal the impact of the low wartime birth rate before 1947. In the junior grades the trough has been reached in 1954-55. In the middle grades the numbers were still falling in 1955-56. The senior grades are affected only beginning with 1956-57. The now available figures for 8-10 grades (for R.S.F.S.R. only) which increased from 993,500 in 1950-51, to 3,396,000 in 1955-56, have dropped to 3,375,900 in 1956-57. (*Narodnoye Khozyaystvo* R.S.F.S.R. 1957, p. 308). But between 1950 and 1955 the number of youngsters in senior secondary schools has increased $3\frac{1}{2}$ times. Between 1954 and 1955 the numbers graduating from 10 year schools have increased by 23 per cent. The scope of secondary education will probably continue to increase substantially. How quickly it will succeed in embracing the total age group 15 to 17 must remain, however, a matter for speculation. So far the 5 year increase in enrollment has been accompanied by some 1 per cent increase in fall out. In 1950-51 it stood at 5.9 per cent at the graduation from 7th grade, at 7.3 at the end of the 8th grade, and at 5.1 in the 9th grade. In 1954-55 the respective figures were 6.2, 8.2 and 5.6 per cent.

Changes in the School Curriculum

The breathtaking expansion of the number of young people to be educated in full secondary schools and the fact that they may no longer count upon entry into institutions of higher learning was bound to affect the curriculum. The destalinization and the present retreat from the principle of collective leadership has had a further impact upon it. Together they resulted in two major reform trends, the "politechnization" and the "depoliticizing" of the school programs.

The first term is an official one. It signifies the inclusion of practical labor activities in the curriculum as a device to tie education to the realities of a working class society and as means of training the pupils for non-white collar occupations. It was officially

introduced in the first decades of Soviet rule as a logical follow up of the "complex themes" with which Soviet education experimented in the twenties. The return to formalistic training and the emergence of specialized technical schools has by 1937 officially banished politechnization from the Soviet schools. That elements of it have nevertheless survived can be seen if only from the emergence of labor reserve schools after the war, and from the fact that a pedagogical text published in 1950 (I. T. Ogorodnikov and P. N. Shchimbirev, *Pedagogika*, Moscow, 1950, p. 66) contains a chapter on politechnical education and praises it for its role in the defense of the country against the Germans. By 1952 politechnization was restored to official usage and since then a steady curriculum reform has been in progress. This reform took form of a new program published in August 1955. The difference from the requirements of the old curriculum is given in the following table. It shows hours per week devoted to particular subjects in the full ten year school:

	Before 1953	1955-6
Russian language and Literature	92 $\frac{1}{2}$	84 $\frac{1}{2}$
Mathematics	64	60
History and Constitution of the U.S.S.R.	23 $\frac{1}{2}$	21
Logic	2	0
Foreign Language	22	20
Geography	16	14 $\frac{1}{2}$
Biology	13 $\frac{1}{2}$	12
Psychology	2	1
Physics	14 $\frac{1}{2}$	16 $\frac{1}{2}$
Handicrafts, agricultural, mechanical, etc. training	0	16

(From *Soviet Survey*, February 1957, p. 13)

The changes in favor of politechnization resulted in the introduction of handwork lessons and cuts in mathematics in grades 1 to 5 inclusively, and in a more gradual change over to the new curriculum in the senior grades, with increases in physics and the introduction of new practical training in agriculture, machine construction and electromechanics. The new reform was planned to be binding for the following five

years but only a year later the Twentieth Congress pointed to its shortcomings. Kruhshov referred then to educators "still busy with general talk about the value of politechnical instruction instead of doing something to put it into practice." To be "quicker in going over from words to deeds" politechnical education was since then to include not only new school subjects but also programs for pupils designed to "systematically accustom them to working in the factories, collective and state farms, experimental plots, and school workshops." Accordingly, the practical work on machinery, electrical engineering and agriculture in the senior three grades was replaced by a new subject called "the bases of industrial and agricultural production" and by direct production practice in industrial and agricultural plants.

Other aspects of the tendency to enhance manual labor include an outcry against overloading with formal subjects. As a result the hours of required homework have been reduced and the year-end examinations have been abolished or made easier. The new look also had its repercussions in the universities resulting in: the relocation of professional institutes closer to the industries they serve, a new statute on students' practical work in them, the reduction of the number of examinations, the reduction of the number of lectures in favor of independent study and discussions, and last but not least, a preferential admission policy for candidates with prior industrial or military service.

It has been noted that the traditional climate within the Soviet schools aided by the necessity of programming some students for college and by the attraction which the prospect of a college career has for all youth, has so far rendered politechnization rather ineffective. The same cannot be said about the reform of the political content of the curriculum which has been substantially affected by recent changes of the party line.

The reformed curriculum, as presented

above, witnesses most of these changes as applied to subjects with some political content. They include the reduction of hours devoted to Russian, geography and biology, a lesser cut in hours devoted to history, psychology and foreign language, and a complete eclipse of logic. The reforms pertaining to history and logic are perhaps most significant. They eliminated altogether the teaching of dialectical materialism. They once more necessitated the rewriting of history textbooks to clear them from the "cult of personality." Stalin's standard *Short History of the Communist Party* was, of course, withdrawn. At the end of the 1956 academic year there was no final history examination in the 10th grade. The current academic years was marked by the teaching of some subjects without textbooks, and the use of old textbooks in other subjects but with a caution to teachers that certain portions in them deviate from the socialist truth. For the forthcoming academic year (1958-59), a whole list of revised textbooks has now been prepared. They are listed in No. 147 of the *Sovetskie Knigi* (Moscow 1957, pp. 41-52).

Equally significant is the new emphasis not only on moral education but on esthetic training. In addition to the "manifold ways and means, to make pupils high-principled and to make them devoted citizens of their socialist country" a renewed emphasis has been placed on drawing, singing and literature in the classroom and on developing music, literature and art appreciation in out-of-school activities. Two new Soviet books written as handbooks for educators emphasize the importance of esthetics in Marxist thought. (V. K. Skatershchikov, *Osnovi Marksistsko-Leninskoi Estetiki*, Moscow, 1957, and P. S. Trofimov, *O Marksistsko-Leninskoi Estetike Kak Nauke*, Moscow, 1957.) Here is yet another and final example of how new substitutes are sought to peg to some eternal verities the slippery and elusive principles of a shrinking political philosophy.

G.Z.F.B.

THE SIGNIFICANCE OF AMERICAN SCHOOLS IN LATIN AMERICA

In each of the twenty republics of Latin America may be found one or more American Schools employing administrative practices and teaching techniques common to the schools of the United States. The total enrollment of such schools in 1957 has been estimated by the Inter-American Schools Service to be in excess of one hundred thousand pupils. Their significance is found in their contribution to the education of boys and girls, to the improvement of teaching, and to the development of better international understanding among peoples.

American Schools in Latin America supplement rather than compete with national schools. It is estimated that approximately one fifth of the elementary school enrollment and more than one third of the secondary school enrollment in these countries are in private schools. American private schools are sought by Latin Americans for their children because the schools provide an opportunity for Latin American pupils to become proficient in use of the English language while completing an elementary and/or secondary education within the boundaries of the pupil's country. A paragraph from the prospectus of Ruston Academy, an American School in Havana, emphasizes the significance of Latin American pupils, particularly younger ones, being able to learn English and becoming accustomed to teaching techniques common in the United States while remaining at home.

During the years of its existence, the school (Ruston Academy) has gradually assumed a second function, now of equal importance to the first; that of instructing Cuban boys and girls in the English language and under American educational methods. Apart from overcoming the more obvious disadvantages of change in climate and separation of students from their families, the existence of the school has done much to eliminate two greater risks of sending Cuban youth to the North to study.

Those risks are: first, that the boy or girl will not retain perfect mastery of his native tongue; second, and more important, that the student who lives long abroad will lose contact with his own land and miss the spirit of patriotism which is the birthright of every child.

Many American School pupils plan later to attend a school or college in the United States. A recent study of eight American Schools, spread from Mexico to Argentina, shows that nearly fifteen per cent of their annual enrollment on the secondary level withdraws to enter a school, and seventy per cent or more enter college or university, in the United States or Canada.³ For Latin Americans who plan a college career in the United States, the college preparatory curricula offered in bilingual American Schools equip them with an understanding and use of the English language not to be had in national schools with national teachers teaching English as a foreign language in classes that meet less than five times per week. Accreditation of American Schools in Latin America by accrediting agencies of the United States assures graduates of the acceptance of their secondary school work by colleges and universities in the United States which are members of similar agencies. Already twenty American Schools in Latin America have become members of the Southern Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools. This is particularly important to Latin Americans because graduates of non-member schools may find it necessary to pass an entrance examination—a difficult task for the well prepared pupil who is not proficient in English.

American Schools in Latin America are also significant to North Americans living in Latin America because of the educational opportunities such schools provide for their children. By the close of the nineteenth century several small colonies of people from

the United States were living in Latin America. They were principally located in the fruit growing sections of Central America, in the mining regions of the Andes mountains, and in the oil fields of Colombia and Venezuela. Children living in these colonies seldom attended national schools because the families lived in such isolated places that it was impractical to utilize the better educational facilities of metropolitan areas. Another reason why children coming from the United States did not attend national schools was the absence of an understanding of Latin Americans, their language and customs, and a lack of incentive on the part of people coming from the United States to acquire such an understanding. People migrating to Latin America from the United States, unlike those from Asia and from Europe, rarely become permanent residents. They plan an early return to the homeland and prefer that their children continue with an educational program similar to that to be had at home. The North Americans who do remain in Latin America for a number of years usually plan a college education in the United States for their children. These parents desire a secondary school program which gives adequate preparation for college entrance in the United States. The number of North Americans in Latin America has increased in recent years. These people and the United States interests they represent have, for reasons indicated above, contributed to the establishment and maintenance of the more than three hundred American Schools that now exist in Latin America.

Private schools in Latin America are held in high esteem by the citizenry of the different Latin American countries because in most cases private schools provide superior teaching facilities and enjoy a selected patronage. This is significant to national teachers in Latin America who show a pronounced desire to teach in American Schools because "the presence of better paid, university-trained United States teachers working along side national teachers has tended to raise the

status of the latter in the eyes of parents".¹¹

While the social significance of teaching in an American School means much to national teachers, there are also professional advantages. Teaching aids and materials are often superior and more abundantly available in American Schools. Latin American national teachers also desire to teach in American Schools because of the opportunity such a position affords for learning and practicing a knowledge of the English language. Knowledge of a second language has greater social and educational significance to Latin Americans than it has to the average North American. As an illustration of this, Lincoln School in San Jose, Costa Rica employed an eminent Costa Rican grammarian as head of the Spanish Department in 1947. At the time of employment he spoke no English. Five years later his bilingual ability was equal to that of any other member of the school's staff. This professor, a title used throughout Latin America for secondary school teachers, attained an accomplishment through his working in an American School which is a source of much pride to him and, to a lesser extent, to his fellow countrymen. The knowledge and use of the English language gained through his associations with an American School also promotes good community-school relations as it demonstrates to an adult world the practicality of the bilingual program of American Schools in Latin America.

In each of the Latin American countries at least one or more American Schools have been officially recognized by the national Ministry of Education. Each school, however, receives this recognition on its own merit. There is no blanket recognition of an American School program in Latin America. The American Institute in La Paz, Bolivia, not only has had its program officially recognized, but has received subventions from the national government for the purpose of executing the program. The American School of Guatemala has been recognized as a laboratory school and is jointly engaged in educational research with the Ministry of

ents".¹¹

ching in
national
advan-
re often
table in
national
merican
such a
cticing a
Knowl-
er social
Ameri-
Ameri-
n School
an emi-
of the
time of
ive years
d to that
ol's staff.
out Latin
chers, at-
is work-
a source
er extent,
nowledge
e gained
American
mmunities
es to an
bilingual
in Latin

countries
ools have
e national
ool, how-
a its own
tion of an
America.
z, Bolivia,
cially rec-
ions from
urpose of
American
recognized
y engaged
Ministry of

ber 1957

Education in developing better teaching materials in Spanish for Guatemalan children. The first constitutional president of Brazil, Dr. Prudent Moraes, was so impressed as a patron with the work of Colegio de Piracicaba, a church-affiliated American School, that he used it as a model for state schools. There are also American Schools in Rio de Janeiro, Sao Paulo, Montevideo, Santiago, Buenos Aires, and other Latin American cities which have made significant contributions to the educational life of the community they serve as technical and experimental schools.

Although never established for this purpose, American Schools in Latin America render a service to the teaching profession of the United States. The per cent of the profession affected in any one year is small but the results are significant. Teachers who go to Latin America to teach in a bilingual school discover it to be a living laboratory of experiences which later may be used to enrich classes taught in the United States. A teaching position in an American School in Latin America provides an excellent opportunity for the teacher who desires to travel but for financial reasons is unable to do so. Such schools either provide travel grants with a two or three year contract, or make some provision for travel in the contract.

American Schools in Latin America provide a foundation for the building on international relations between the United States and other American republics which cannot be easily destroyed. Boys and girls who attend American Schools participating in play and in class activities with children of other nationalities develop a comprehension and respect for the way of life of others not soon to be forgotten. Adults who participate in the activities of an American School as members of a parent-teacher organization or as stockholders of a bilingual and binational cooperatively owned school also develop a better understanding of and regard for other nationalities. The solution of American School problems of policy, finance, and

community-school relations requires a knowledge and comprehension of the ideas and ideals of others to be successful.

Teachers and administrators with experience in American Schools in other countries are sources of personnel for the direction of educational projects on an international level. They have had an opportunity to acquire an understanding and appreciation of skills and attitudes of others which is as essential as language knowledge and technical skills for successful work on an international level.

In some countries, of which Brazil, Chile, Costa Rica, and Ecuador are examples, presidential families have chosen an American School within the country for the education of their children. Sr. Galo Plaza⁹, a former Ecuadorian ambassador to the United States who later was president of Ecuador and simultaneously served as president of the board of governors of the American School in Quito, wrote the following about *his* school.

Owned by a non-profit cooperative organization, the school is co-educational, non-sectarian, bilingual, and endeavors to operate under a single system that incorporates what we consider the essentials of our own school system with what we consider the best in the American School system. . . . My school plants the seeds of democracy early and also wins over parents as the Germans did for their cause years before.

Foreign service diplomats from the United States also recognize the American Schools program in Latin America as an aid to the growth of understanding between peoples of the Americas. The concluding statement in a report on an American School by a United States ambassador to a Central American republic summarizes the significance of American Schools in Latin America for this purpose.

I should like to add that it is my sincere opinion that the cooperation which the United States government is giving American Schools is one of the most useful and vital phases of our entire program of cultural cooperation. Aid to such schools necessarily comes under the heading of a long range program for the promotion

of mutual understanding and there is nothing we are doing in this part of the world which is going to prove more fruitful over the years than this.²

DEAN T. FITZGERALD

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Davis, Roy Tasco. "American Private Schools in Latin America," *Bulletin of National Association of Secondary School Principals*, Volume 29 (May 1945) 49-55.
2. Davis, Roy Tasco. "Schoolroom Embassies," *The Record*, Volume 5: No. 1 (January 1949), 1-6.
3. Fitzgerald, Dean. *American Schools in Latin America*. Tulsa: Unpublished Doctor's dissertation. University of Tulsa, 1954. 201.
4. Fitzgerald, Dean. "Latin America's Bilingual Schools Are Workshops of Democracy," *The Nation's Schools*, Volume 43: No. 5 (October 1951), 68-70.
5. Fitzgerald, Dean. "The Role of American

- Schools in Latin America," *The School Review*, Vol. 43: No. 5. (May 1955), 290-297.
6. Houle, Cyril. "Some Significant Experiments in Latin American Education," *Elementary School Journal*, Vol. 49: No. 2 (October 1948), 61-67.
7. Howard, George P. *We Americans North and South*. New York: Friendship Press, 1951, 160.
8. Marx, Martha. "American Communities and Their Schools," *The Bulletin Board* (Buenos Aires, Arg.), Volume XV: No. 9 (December 1950), 10.
9. Plaza, Galo. "Experiment in International Education," *The Nation's Schools*, Vol. 37: No. 5 (May 1946), 43.
10. Rex Fredrick J. "From the Ground Floor Up in International Education," *Teacher's College Record*, Volume 49: No. 4 (January 1948), 251.
11. Ward, Douglas. "A Bilingual, Binational School," *Pbi Delta Kappan*, Vol. 28: No. 9 (May 1947), 377.

THE YEARBOOK PUBLICATIONS IN COMPARATIVE EDUCATION

Whereas the organization and level of scholarship of some of the textbooks has led many professors of comparative education to look upon them as a mixed blessing, the Yearbooks concerned with comparative education have been acknowledged with greater enthusiasm. Their general execution seems to be of a higher order. Their periodical nature renders the information they offer much more up-to-date. In several cases they supply data about little accessible areas. Sometimes they elaborate important problems, otherwise neglected. Nearly always they bring in the English language views of governments and foreign educators which might not otherwise be so readily available. Yearbooks are reference sources for quick consultation as well as books for more leisurely reading. They are a useful and continuous basis of much of comparative research and teaching. It is hoped that a brief chronological enumeration of their antecedents and scope will bring them into wider use. It will also help to clear up difficulties resulting from the fact that most of them

bear a similar, sometimes almost identical title.

The oldest of these publications *The Educational Yearbook* no longer appears. It consists of 21 volumes published between 1924 and 1944 by the International Institute of Teachers College, Columbia University, under the editorship of Isaac Kandel. This Yearbook continues to be a useful source of historical information for the period it covers. Some volumes contain also materials and treatments that are not as yet outdated. As old a volume as 1932, for instance, contains much still relevant material on the relations between Church and State in Education. Interspersed between volumes that are descriptive in nature are others dealing with selected problems such as rural education (1938), adult education (1940), or higher education (1943). The 1942 volume represents an intensive study of the Latin American area, which is still of great value. Finally the 1941 volume entitled *The End of an Era* is a provocative overview of the educational developments between the world wars writ-

ten entirely, as a book, by Isaac Kandel.

Next in order of seniority is the British publication the *Yearbook of Education* which was founded in 1932 by Sir Robert Evans and continues, except for the years 1941 to 1947, to the present time. This *Yearbook* is published in London by Evans Brothers, in later years under the sponsorship of the Institute of Education, University of London. Its first editor was Lord Eustace Percy. Under him and under later editorial boards and editors, most lately Nicholas Hans and Joseph Lauwerys, this publication attained a considerable reputation in Britain, the British Commonwealth and other areas of the world. Since 1953 the *Yearbook* is a transatlantic venture, and is now published in the United States by the World Book Company under the joint sponsorship of the University of London, Institute of Education and Teachers College, Columbia University. Its editors, joined by Robert King Hall on behalf of the American Board, have through its means pioneered in the problem approach to comparative education. In 1953 the *Yearbook* dealt with the Status and Position of Teachers, in 1954 with Education and Technological Development, in 1955 with Guidance and Counselling, in 1956 with Education and Economics. The 1957 volume, published in August under the editorship of Joseph Lauwerys and George Bereday, deals with Philosophy and Education not only from philosophical and historical, but also from sociological perspective. The issues of the *Yearbook* now planned are to deal with Secondary School Curriculum in 1958, Higher Education in 1959, and tentatively with Communication Arts in 1960.

The *International Yearbook of Education* is presented next. This *Annuaire* has been published since 1933, except for the years 1940 to 1945, by the International Bureau of Education in Geneva and is distributed in the United States by Columbia University Press and by the United Nations Publication Center. It contains short accounts of yearly educational progress supplied by the gov-

ernments concerned, and for the most part presented to the International Conference on Education that convenes in Geneva each year. This *Yearbook*, now published in French and English, is thus a ready and up-to-date reference source. Its scope, too, is steadily expanding. In 1946 it carried reports on 28 countries, in 1949 on 44, in 1956 (the latest available issue) on 72. Of special interest are the reports on Iron Curtain countries which have made their appearance on the pages of the *Yearbook* one by one, and which culminated in the inclusion of an article on the USSR in the 1954 and subsequent volumes.

Another United Nations reference source, though not properly a yearbook, ought to be mentioned at this point. The *World Survey of Education* published by UNESCO is conceived as a periodical publication. The present volume published in 1955 and containing information up to 1953 is an expanded and improved version of an earlier volume called *World Handbook of Educational Organization and Statistics* published in 1952. Supplemented by M. T. Sasnett's *Educational Systems of the World* (University of Southern California Press, 1952), and W. Chambers' *The Universities of the World Outside U.S.A.* (American Council on Education, 1950), this publication is the standard major reference source on educational organization of the world. The next volume of the survey, now in press, bears the title of *World Survey of Education, Vol. 2. Primary Education*, and contains, in addition to bringing the present volume up-to-date, expanded text and statistics on elementary education. It is planned to publish Vol. 3 with special emphasis on secondary and technical education in 1963, and to resume the cycle by publishing a general volume again in 1966.

The latest addition in the field of the Yearbooks is the *Yearbook on Education Around the World* inaugurated in 1957 by the U. S. Office of Education. This volume bears the title of *Education for Better Living* and deals for the most part with education

in undeveloped countries of Latin America, Asia, and Africa. It also contains chapters on rural and urban problems in the United States and Europe. The interesting and often first hand information contained in it is further enhanced by a welcome inclusion of illustrations. The next volume of this *Yearbook* will be concerned with the organization and functions of the various ministries of education.

This completes the list of Yearbooks devoted wholly to comparative education. To conclude, a mention should be made of other yearbooks which occasionally devote a volume to international education, if not to its comparative aspects. *The Thirty-Sixth Yearbook, Part II, of the National Society for the Study of Education*, edited in 1937 by I. L. Kandel and G. M. Whipple, bears the title of "International Understanding through the Public School Curriculum." Since this *Yearbook* deals not with countries

but with a consecutive analysis of various school subjects as they should be taught to foster international understanding, its message and contents are not altogether out of date. More recent is the *Eleventh Yearbook of the John Dewey Society* published in 1951 by Harper and Brothers and edited by C. O. Arndt and S. Everett. This issue of the *Yearbook* bears the title of "Education for a World Society" and again discusses not areas but institutional factors such as world religions, trade, science, world communications and the role of schools and international organizations in fostering international understanding. In preparation for 1959, is another issue of the *Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education*. This issue now being prepared under the chairmanship of C. O. Arndt, will deal with the established programs and current problems of Fundamental Education.

G.F.Z.B.

Contributors to this Issue

DEAN T. FITZGERALD is Principal of Mark Twain School, Tulsa, Oklahoma. He served as Director of American Schools in Costa Rica, Venezuela, and Ecuador and has received a doctorate at the University of Tulsa for research on American Schools in Latin America.

JOSEPH A. LAUWERYS is Professor of Comparative Education and Chairman of the Board of Studies in Education at the University of London. He is the author of several publications of which the latest are: *History Textbooks and International Understanding*; *The Enterprise of Education*; and *Morals, Education and Democracy* (now in print). He is joint editor of the *Yearbook of Education* and Chairman of the International New Education Fellowship.

PHILIP H. PHENIX is Professor of Education at

Teachers College, Columbia University. He is the author of *Intelligible Religion*; and of *Philosophy of Education* (now in print). He is Fellow of the National Council on Religion in Higher Education.

ROBERT ULICH is James Bryant Conant Professor of Education at Harvard University. He is the author of several publications of which the latest are: *Crisis and Hope in American Education*; *Human Career, A Philosophy of Self-Transcendence*; and *Professional Education as a Humane Study*.

GEORGE Z. F. BEREDAY is Associate Professor of Education at Teachers College, Columbia University and joint editor of the *Yearbook of Education* and editor of the *Comparative Education Review*.

rious
ht to
mes-
ut of
book
ed in
ed by
ue of
ation
cusses
ch as
com-
and
g in-
ation
book
dy of
pared
t, will
d cur-
ion.
F.Z.B.

y. He
and of
t). He
eligion

Profes-
ty. He
which
merican
phy of
Educa-

essor of
lumbia
arbook
arative

r 1957